

Fall 9-10-1997

## Senate Meeting, September 10, 1997

Academic Senate  
*Illinois State University*

Follow this and additional works at: <http://ir.library.illinoisstate.edu/senateminutes>



Part of the [Higher Education Administration Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Senate, Academic, "Senate Meeting, September 10, 1997" (1997). *Academic Senate Minutes*. Paper 625.  
<http://ir.library.illinoisstate.edu/senateminutes/625>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Academic Senate at ISU ReD: Research and eData. It has been accepted for inclusion in Academic Senate Minutes by an authorized administrator of ISU ReD: Research and eData. For more information, please contact [ISUReD@ilstu.edu](mailto:ISUReD@ilstu.edu).

ACADEMIC SENATE AGENDA  
TIME: 7 P.M., Wednesday, September 10, 1997  
PLACE: Circus Room, Bone Student Center

***Call to Order***

***Approval of Minutes of August 27, 1997***

***Chairperson's Remarks***

***Vice Chairperson's Remarks***

***Student Government Association President's Remarks***

***Administrators' Remarks***

***Committee Reports***

***Action Items:***

- 1) 07.29.97.01 Election of Faculty (3) and Students (2) to the Search Committee for the Associate Vice President for Research and Dean of Graduate Studies
- 2) Appointments to Committees
- 3) 04.17.97.02 To Paul Borg from Jan Cook regarding Proposed Changes in Structure of Council on General Education: Blue Book and By-Laws Amendments

***Information Items:***

- 1) Draft 1 - Revisions to the Illinois State University Constitution

***Communications***

- 1) Sense of Senate Resolution from Joel Brooks
- 2) 09.02.97.01 Sense of Senate Resolution from Marjorie Jones

***Adjournment***

*Meetings of the Academic Senate are open to members of the University community. Persons attending the meeting participate in discussion with the consent of the Senate. Persons desiring to bring items to the attention of the Senate may do so by contacting any member of the Senate.*

**ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES**  
(approved)

**September 10, 1997**

**Volume XXIX, No. 2**

**Call to Order**

The meeting was called to order at 7:04 p.m. by Chairperson, Paul Borg.

**Roll Call**

Secretary Joel Brooks called the roll and declared a quorum.

**Approval of Minutes**

**XXIX-09** Motion by Senator Weber (seconded by Clark) to approve minutes of August 27, 1997, with the following correction:

- page 9, Motion XXIX-06 by Senator Brooks (seconded by *Reid*) a Sense of the Senate Resolution.

Carried unanimously on a voice vote with no abstentions.

**Chairperson's Remarks**

Chairperson Paul Borg said at the Executive Committee meeting on September 2, we did not have a quorum. One of the discussion items was the Sense of the Senate Resolution that was postponed from the last meeting.

1. I will make a few comments about the Sense of the Senate Resolutions:

- a Sense of the Senate Resolution is a way for the Senate to comment on something
- it is not a matter of ordinary business or responsibility
- it is a way for the Senate to go on record about something

I have had the impression that it is generally a unanimous or nearly unanimous feeling about something that is then stated officially.

What is appropriate for a Sense of the Senate Resolution? Whatever someone wants to bring up, in order to have the Senate express an opinion. At one point in the Senate's existence there was a rule that prohibited political comment from the Senate. It was to keep things from impeding the regular business of the Senate. About 2-3 years ago the Senate voted to rescind that rule. The example in that argument had to do with things that have a political discussion, but bore directly on the University, such as:

- why cannot the Academic Senate take a position on legislation before the State Assembly that had to do with our own well-being.

Tonight we will have two examples of what can be brought forward as a Sense of the Senate Resolution:

- one should be non-controversial, representing a generous and genuine expression of sentiment to Professor Sol Shulman.
- the second is more controversial; Senators at the last meeting were concerned or surprised and asked for a postponement. We are, in fact, discussing ourselves and our own active involvement in the running of this University. The danger involves misinterpreting or over-interpreting what it says.

I do not believe that we should prevent these matters from being discussed. I will:

- try to keep the discussion to what the Sense of the Senate Resolution says, and
- limit issues extraneous to the wording of the Resolution

2. There will be a meeting for the University at large, concerning changes in the Constitution on Tuesday, September 23 from 5:00-7:00 pm at Capen Auditorium. This will, also, be an information item tonight. The meeting will inform the general university population of what is going on, what progress has been made, and allow access to everyone for reactions, concerns, etc. Rules Committee has been very helpful in dealing with this as one of the planned venues for getting input before anything is set in concrete.

3. This morning the Executive Committees of the Senate, AP Council, and Civil Service Council, were invited to a periodic legislative breakfast. We met with Representative Brady, and it was a very informational gathering. We were told how good we are and how much good has happened to us. We responded that we are happy about that, but not all issues have been resolved.

#### **Questions:**

*Senator White* requested that a faculty caucus follow the General University meeting, and before the Senate meeting in which we vote on the revised Constitution. *Reply* - Chairperson Borg said we could meet after the meeting on Tuesday. Senator Cook said Rules would like to receive more concrete suggestions from various groups that are not members of the Senate. After the faculty caucus, we will come up with the "big draft," the one that will be forwarded to the Senate and to the Board for reading and information in October. *Senator White* said he understood that it is to be drafted by October 6. *Reply* - Senator Cook said the proposal will be an information item for the Senate and the Board on October 6.

#### **Vice Chairperson's Remarks**

Vice Chairman Joe Jannazzo said September 9 there was a SGA meeting at which the SGA legislators and executives were informed about the proposed changes in the Constitution and student input and concerns were sought about what needs to be changed in the Constitution.

There is also a Student Caucus on Wednesday, September 17, at 7:00 p.m. in the First West Lounge, Bone Student Center. Will discuss concerns about the ISU Constitution and other student concerns.

#### **Student Government Association President's Remarks**

Chairperson Borg said SGA President, Jason Barickman has a class until 8:00 p.m. on Wednesdays. From the Student Government, Mr. Mannion is available to give the perspective of the Student Government in his absence.

#### **Administrator's Remarks**

**President Strand** said the Science Laboratory Dedication was held Tuesday, September 9. It was very successful. I want to thank the people in this room who were involved in facilitating the dedication process. Also I want to congratulate members of the faculty and staff who



have the good fortune of using this facility. This building will help attract people to the University, not just to the Science Department.

I will provide an enrollment update for Provost Urice, who is out of town. The census day for our Fall semester enrollment is Friday, September 12. At this point we are:

- up in the undergraduate level
- down very slightly at the graduate level
- overall total is up in terms of enrollment over where we were last year at this time
- ethnic enrollment is up for all categories

There has been a Task Force established to examine the seating arrangements in Redbird Arena. Redbird Arena has been open since 1989 and the same seating plan has been in place. All constituent groups are represented on the Task Force, which is chaired by Al Otto, a faculty member, faculty representative to the NCAA, and also a member of the Athletic Council. Scott Joyce, Student Trustee, is one of the students on the committee. The recommendations of the Task Force will be submitted to Rick Greenspan, Athletic Director, by November 1. Changes recommended will be effective for the FY98/99 season. There are many factors to be weighed that pertain to student and faculty staff seats in Redbird Arena.

#### **Questions:**

*Senator Weber* asked if there is more specific information about the undergraduate enrollment being up and the graduate enrollment being down? Is there a concern that graduate enrollment is not as great as it was last year? *Reply* - President Strand said he hesitates to quote the numbers because the numbers are unofficial, and the census date will be Friday, September 12. There is concern that the graduate enrollment is down slightly, at this point.

*Senator Walters* asked about the memorandum dated August 25, regarding the surveillance equipment. Mention of a University Policy use in electronic equipment under surveillance. *Reply* - Chairperson Borg said this is a matter on information for the Senate. I should have mentioned it in my comments.

**Provost Urice** excused absence.

**Vice President Boschini** said in conjunction with Student Government, the fee review process will begin this week. That process heavily involves students and faculty, and several people on Senate are involved with the process.

**Vice President Taylor** no remarks.

#### **Committee Reports:**

*Academic Affairs:* Senator Lockwood said Academic Affairs met at 6:00 p.m. tonight. We appointed the members of the Ad Hoc Baccalaureate Degree Review Committees. We have a proposal the Senate will receive in 2 weeks.

Academic Affairs will be discussing a review of the structure of minor degree programs.

Administrative Affairs: Senator Clark said Administrative Affairs met September 3 and produced a ballot for Search Committee for Associate Vice President and Dean of Graduate Studies as an action item.

Administrative Affairs will meet at 6:00 pm on September 24, 1997.

Budget: Senator Nelsen said the Budget Committee met at 6:00 pm before the Senate meeting. They had a discussion with Vice President Taylor about the several ongoing projects involving the Budget Committee. There is a proposal on tourism that we will look at when the next meeting is scheduled.

Faculty Affairs: Senator Weber said Faculty Affairs met at 6:00 p.m. tonight. They discussed the progress by the committee working on revising the faculty evaluation system. That is URC and two from FAC.

There is a faculty meeting scheduled for September 30 at 5:00 p.m., in Moulton, room 208 to discuss this.

Rules: Senator Cook said Rules Committee has a meeting every Wednesday to discuss the responses to the 1st draft of the Constitution.

We have brought forward 2 names of faculty for appointments to external committees. Senator Jannazzo has brought forward a large number of students.

Rules was asked to formulate a procedure for the selection of a faculty member to serve on the Faculty Advisory Committee to the Illinois Board of Higher Education. Those seats rotate along the public and private universities. We are forwarding a proposal to Faculty Affairs, which is our recommendation that the seat be filled by a person nominated by Faculty Affairs from among the ranks of: full time, tenured, and Professors. This will need to be voted on by the Senate. This will be routed through the FAC.

Student Affairs: Senator Weldon said Student Affairs Committee met at 1:00 p.m. today. We began by deciding our set of issues to be addressed for this semester. The historical lack of activity in this committee is going to make it difficult. At the Student Caucus we are going to try and get a better picture of what we can accomplish.

#### **Action Items:**

07.29.97.01 1) *Election of Faculty (3) and Students (2) to the Search Committee for the Associate Vice President for Research and Dean of Graduate Studies Appointments to Committees*

XXIX-10 Motion by Senator Jannazzo for nomination of:

#### **Students:**

Martha Phares, COM  
Kathleen King, SED

The motion passed unanimously on a voice vote with no abstentions.

Elected by ballot:

**Faculty**

Arnold J. Insel, MAT

R. Kay Moss, C&I

Anthony J. Otsuka, BSC

2) ***Appointments to Committees***

**XXIX-11** i) Motion by Senator Cook (seconded by Newgren) faculty nomination to:

**Reinstatement Committee:** Derek McCracken, BSC - CAS

**Athletic Council:** Laurie Thompson-Merriman, THE - CFA

The motion passed unanimously on a voice vote with no abstentions.

**XXIX-12** ii) Motion by Senator Jannazzo ( seconded by Gore) to vote as a slate for Students for following committees:

**Honors Council:**

Matthew Dietch	Senior	Chemistry
Allison Leigh Krietemeir	Sophomore	Elementary Education
Matt Bussan	Sophomore	Chemistry
Shannon Falls	Sophomore	Accounting
Myra Read	Junior	Economics

**Student Grievance Committee:**

Steven Brandstedt	Junior	Political Science
Heather Freeman	Senior	
Erin Snow	Junior	Accounting

**SCERB:**

Kate Lueck	Senior	Psychology
------------	--------	------------

**Bone/Braden Policy Board:**

Robert Arcuri	Senior	Finance
Gene Brucker	Senior	Political Science
Margaret Gholson	Senior	Music, Liberal Arts
LaToya Grayson	Senior	Psychology
Bruce Morris	Junior	Political Science
(Ryan Bonnet)	Sophomore	Medical Technology

**Athletic Council:**

Matt Vaughn (non-athlete)	Senior	Business Ad/Mkt
---------------------------	--------	-----------------

**Questions:**

**Senator Gore** asked about appointments on the Bone/Braden Policy Board. It was my understanding that the SGA is to make the recommendations to appoint those committees.

*Reply* - Chairperson Borg said these committees are external to the Senate, so the Senate elects these members. The recommendations come to the Senate. **Senator Gore** said his understanding is that the recommendations for fee boards should be coming from the SGA.

*Reply* - Chairperson Borg said the recommendations were solicited from these various bodies by the students on the executive committee of the SGA and the Student Senators.

**Senator Cook** asked if this a study for fees for use of facilities in the union, or a study of other student fees. *Reply* - Chairperson Borg could not answer.

**Chairperson Borg** said to table the Bone/Braden Policy Board slate of candidates until the nature of this confusion is heard. Accepted by Senator Jannazzo.

The motion passed unanimously on a voice vote with no abstentions.

Nomination of student athletes to Athletic Council:

**Males**

Eric Eckenstahler

Brandon Kepple

**Females**

Pina Genrile

Jennifer Liepa

**Election of 1 male athlete and 1 female athlete to Athletic Council** by ballot:

Brandon Kepple

Jennifer Liepa

XXIX-13

Motion by Senator Cook (seconded by Nelsen), approval to *Proposed Changes in Structure of Council on General Education; Blue Book and By-Laws Amendments* as described in the memo distributed and dated March 6 with the amendment provided by the Rules Committee in the memo on page 17, and with the correction of title for Dr. Dillingham's office (04.17.97.02).

Dr. Alan Dillingham is present and available on content of the proposal. Rules committee recommended a one word change in wording.

The motion passed unanimously on a voice vote with no abstentions.

**Information Items:**

**Draft 1 - Revisions to the Illinois State University Constitution.**

Senator Cook said recommendations have been made to Rules Committee, that a Faculty Assembly be established in parallel with the SGA, AP Council, and Civil Service Council. It would receive responsibility for some procedural matters which are currently reported to Academic Senate. Recommend that the chairperson of the FA receive a seat on the University Senate, like the SGA chair. Recommending that Senate members should be expanded to include 2 representatives each, AP Council and Civil Service Council. Informed the councils of our recommendation and asked to forward to us suggestions on how they would select their

representatives, whether this should be part of the Constitution or part of their own by-laws, and what functions they saw the Senate having that would be interest to their body.

AP Council and Civil Service Council are continuing to discuss this matter. They are talking about 2 members. They are thinking of coming back with suggestions for appropriate functions, perhaps balance of membership if we go to a University Senate. These councils have not had time to react as body.

Received suggestions from other people, pointing out oversights, broad suggestions. On September 8 we received a document from the President of 20 pages, with comments and suggestions. We have not yet been able to incorporate everything that has been received.

The meeting of September 23 is an opportunity to propose questions to the University at large and to allow other individuals to make statements about their proposals to the University at large. We will collect responses. There are 3 major questions to be addressed:

- I. should there be a faculty assembly – faculty should answer
- II. should the Academic Senate be changed to a University body – university should answer
- III. what is the function of the Senate and role within the University –receive broad discussion

Comments from the President pointed out to us that we need more information about the relative relationships among the four constituency groups if this becomes a University body instead of an Academic body. President Strand's revisions have been distributed. There are 3 recurring themes and some confusion as to how to interpret those themes. We referred to:

- I. channels of communication between the campus and the board – we asked for clarification
- II. function of Senate with regard to formulation of policy to remain in the body they reside
- III. what sort of internal structure should there be in terms of the first draft and should there be a separate faculty assembly body, what relationship among the various Senates or Council should there be, and how that fits into the nature of responsibility for policy formulation and communication.

The President has suggested that Dr. Kern, Chairperson Borg, Senator Jannazzo, and Senator Cook, sit down and examine the wording in detail, until we find mutually recognized definitions and terms to use to express these concepts.

#### **Questions/Comments:**

**Chairperson Borg** said we have a desire for input, especially concerning if we have left out any major kind of issue.

**President Strand** said proposed changes are designed to bring the Constitution into conformance with the Board of Trustees Governing Document. The changes I propose maintain the "ground up" of process on matters for which the faculty has primary responsibility. A quote from a section of the BOT Document, page A6. "The Board recognizes that the fac-

ulty has primary responsibility in matters of student recruitment and retention, academic standards, the fundamental areas of curriculum and the necessary policies and procedures for its conduct, subject matter in methods of instruction, instructional matters, methods of research, and general requirements for degrees. The Board further recognizes the appropriate role of faculty, in recommending to the President faculty appointments, reappointments, promotion, tenure, and salary incrementation. It encourages significant students and staff participation decision making processes, which affect these groups when such participation can be effective." Further, I can state that the Academic Senate still has an important role in, and mechanism to communicate, with the Board of Trustees. Section A, Item VII,B of the BOT document indicates, "The Academic Senate as established in the University Constitution, shall serve as the primary body for consultation regarding the establishment of academic guidelines and academic procedures of the University. In the event of serious disagreement between the President and a majority of the members comprising the Academic Senate, the Senate through established Board procedures shall have an opportunity, through a spokesperson, to explain its views before the Board at the time the President brings the matter to the Board." References made in Section 10, page B3, to the means by which individuals can address the Board. While these proposed changes may appear in the eyes of some people and be dramatic, they are in fact, simply bringing into congruence the Constitution so that it complements the Board of Trustees Governing Document. I am willing to meet with the subcommittee of the Rules Committee, so we can work through this process.

**Senator Brooks** referred to page 14, Article IV, Section 1B, regarding selection procedure for Illinois State University President. The Constitution needs to be consistent with the BOT Document. How is this inconsistent? *Reply* - Senator Strand said the statute establishing the BOT as all Boards, indicates that the Board has responsibility for the selection and continuation or removal of any Presidents. The BOT Governing Document emulates that statute in its language.

**Chairperson Borg** said if it is inappropriate in a Constitution, where is it appropriate? *Reply* - Senator Strand said as the draft goes to the Board in October, with differing perspectives. Those will be submitted to the Board as part of the draft, and the Board will have the opportunity to address the question. **Chairperson Borg** said this is an issue that we need to look at for the location of the information.

**Senator Razaki** said the language is not written into the Constitution itself. Is some attempt going to be made to formalize the processing, so that no matter who occupies the position, there will be understanding? *Reply* - Senator Cook said that is to be the outcome of the small sub-committee to get language that is not subject to various interpretations.

**Senator White** said at the last Senate meeting your response was, "With regard to the University Constitution, I will ensure that no changes will be proposed to the Board unilaterally by the administration." Closing statement, "Those changes will be forwarded to the Board of Trustees for adoption or returned to the Senate with recommendations for suggested changes." This seems to imply that what you just alluded to, could not ever happen. You seem to imply that it was possible to imagine a moment in which a particular take would be forwarded, as part of the Constitution, that an alternative perspective could be provided contrary to that. The Board would be asked to choose between those. Is that accurate? *Reply* -

President Strand said not completely. I propose that changes go to the Board with the indication, not alternate language, the the Office of the President agrees or dis-agrees with the proposed changes. *Senator White* asked if the Board would be free to make a unilateral decision? *Reply* - President Strand said no.

*Senator Cook* said there is another theme that has been brought forward. The relationship between sections of this document and the new APST proposal that will be coming forward. We will talk with the joint committee, to see if there are items in the Constitution that need to be transferred to the new ASPT Document.

*Senator White* asked if the Ad Hoc committee meets with the President, how will they get input from the Senators about our reactions? *Reply* - Chairperson Borg asked for a suggestion. *Senator White* suggested a caucus for the Senators to advise with Ad Hoc before meeting with the President. *Reply* - Chairperson Borg said we can schedule a meeting to make comments. Will send an e-mail and set up an available schedule to take comments.

*Senator Weber* asked if need to announce 10 days in advance of the meeting. *Reply* - Chairperson Borg said will call the meeting in 10 days and be available for other discussion. In the meantime, this is an important issue.

*Senator Varner* asked how the Ad Hoc will be appointed? *Reply* - Senator Cook said the committee will address the wording of the points related to the policy making process, and the nature of advice.

*Senator Nelsen* asked when is the next scheduled Rules Committee meeting? *Reply* - Senator Cook said the meeting is at 6:00 p.m., Wednesday, September 17, in Bone Student Center.

*Senator Reid* said on page 3 President Strand suggests changing to conform with the "Board of Trustees Governing Document." What are the reasons for that change and the implications of the change? *Reply* - President Strand said part of the perception in the minds of some people, is that the Constitution is a free-standing document equal to the Board of Regents Governing Document. There is only one policy making body, there is only one policy document. It is the Board of Trustees Document. *Senator Reid* asked if there is a different legal status of this, if this is not acceptable? *Reply* - President Strand said no. It is clarifying language, that has been present for many years and has been misinterpreted.

*Senator Clark* said to announce to all the Senators where the Rules Committee meeting will be held on Wednesday, Sept. 17. *Reply* - Chairperson Borg said to be sure the e-mail address is current.

*Senator Razaki* said that Ad Hoc Committees dealing with the ASPT document. How close is the connection between that document and the Constitution. The subcommittee working on ASPT document does not envision having anything in complete form, for quite some time. What about the time deadlines in this process? When are things due? *Reply* - Chairperson Borg said the purpose is to solve and resolve the constitution questions initially, the ASPT issue, later. Senator Cook said there are things in the Constitution that are duplicated in the



current ASPT document. They might be deleted from the Constitution without losing their effect. **Senator Razaki** said under the proposed Constitution part of what the Faculty Assembly is taking over a rule of the URC. *Reply* - Senator Cook said it was our understanding that if URC was a policy recommending body, would remain a subcommittee of the Senate. Appeals bodies would shift. Those are procedural entities. The policy would come through the Senate.

**Senator Kurtz** asked for re-wording in reference to discussion *Reply* - President Strand said the University Constitution has existed since 1969. This phrase has never been a part of the Constitution. To add to the definition at this point has been conveyed to me by some people as not being appropriate. **Senator Kurtz** asked what people, in what way this ???? *Reply* - President Strand said he did not question them as to the motive for their statement **Senator Kurtz** said this is an official document

**Senator Blum** asked if it would be possible to request the reconsideration of the wording. The governance affects many academic decisions. There is a current move in the URC to emphasize the importance of participation to make the University run. *Reply* - President Strand said if there was some alternate language he would be willing to examine the alternate language.

**Senator Razaki** asked if President Strand does perceive changes in circumstances? *Reply* - President Strand said there have been some changes of considerable moment that have taken place at the University within the last 2 years.

**Senator White** asked about the word "veto". *Reply* - Senator Cook said it does not appear anywhere. **Senator White** asked whether they have plans for the word veto? *Reply* - Senator Cook said something passed by the Senate, will not automatically be accepted. Senator White said he has concern about adding another level of examination of decisions. *Reply* - Senator Cook said the faculty caucus carries out this function after decisions have been made and brought forward. This was initiated originally at the time of handling equity.

**Senator Gore** asked about the original draft of the Constitution. The description of the faculty assembly and its responsibilities with the Constitution, should we also be considering establishing the SGA? *Reply* - Senator Cook said the faculty assembly does not currently exist, a preliminary description must be given of its initial forum. Then it can adopt by-laws of its own.

**Senator Brook** asked regarding the University Senate is this just a change in wording from the Academic Senate, or is it the actual function of the new senate going to be different? *Reply* - Senator Cook said if this becomes a University Senate, with the participation of staff, then it is presumed it would not be worth their while to participate, if the Senate did not address some other matters. If those groups cannot identify anything they would like to put into the functioning of the University Senate, as opposed to an Academic Senate, then presumably, they will not want us to make any change.



### **Communications:**

- XXIX-14** Motion for *The Sense of Senate Resolution* (09.02.97.01) from Marjorie Jones( seconded by Weber.) Senator Jones recognized the many people that made the new Science Building possible. Single out one person with:

#### *The Sense of the Senate Resolution*

*We, the Academic Senate at Illinois State University, do highly commend Dr. Sol Shulman, Professor Emeritus, for his exceptional work and interest in the new science building. His concern and dedication to a functional and safe science laboratory building are recognized by the Senate. Because of his hard work and careful attention to detail in this building, we can be proud of this new campus facility for many years to come.*

### **Discussion:**

**Senator Craddock** said as a Chemistry student, he knows what Dr. Shulman did to help produce the science building. In discussion with other Student Senators, they are not aware of this information. Could you briefly describe his time and effort? *Reply* - Senator Jones said Dr. Shulman started with the original decisions to push funding, working with the architects on building plans, essentially watching every step of the way, from the first shovel of dirt to the last day before dedication checking the tile and painting. He watched every step including electrical, construction, decorating. He was there nights/days/week-ends. He did an enormous amount of oversight. Senator Weber said he recognized on a creator act, interacted on a continuing basis, recognizing and resolving many problems as they came up. The building could not be what it is now, if it had not been for his dedication. Senator Clark said Dr. Shulman actually looked at the construction of the building, down to the individual fittings, and rejected items that were not to the standard, and found bugs in the system that nobody knew about.

Passed unanimously on a voice vote with no abstentions.

- XXIX-06** Motion postponed at August 27 Senate meeting by Senator Brooks (seconded by Reid) a *Sense of the Senate Resolution*.

**Whereas**, clerical workers are an indispensable part of the ISU family, and

**Whereas**, they will be at least 30% behind parity at the end of the three-year contract proposed by University negotiators, and

**Whereas**, the concept of parity compared to other state employees in the same positions as a cornerstone of equitable salary policy,

Therefore we the members of the Academic Senate:

- 1) Strongly oppose the unfair and penurious wage proposal offered by the University;
- 2) Urge President Strand to authorize a salary proposal to clerical workers that is reflective of the substantial contributions these individuals make to the success of ISU and that acknowledges the goal of wage parity.

### **Questions/Comments:**

**President Strand** said when we talk about our clerical workers we recognize what a valuable element they are of our total university community; we are doing everything possible to reach a satisfactory resolution with the body and its union. I recommend that you not accept on

face value all of the wording in the Sense of the Senate Resolution or the supporting documents provided by AFSCME.

**Senator Brooks** asked about the document submitted by the President at the last Senate meeting from Human Resources. [(Appendix B) in the 8/27 minutes.] The fourth paragraph states that "the salary level of all classifications represented by the bargaining unit would reach at least 95% of downstate public university averages." The other side of the sheet that is charitably speaking, suspect because it compares fall 1996 statistics with what clerical workers would be earning through the summer of 1998. I respectfully submit that the President of the University is compelled to the same standard of accuracy that we would expect for students using the new science laboratories. This misrepresenting of statistics is not acceptable from the students, nor is it acceptable from the President.

**President Strand** said the figures which we cite for November 1996, are the latest figures available to the University at this point. That is why the \* (asterisk) was purposely used to clarify that it refers to November 1996. Current information is not available.

**Senator VanVooren** said it is good to get some resolution passed, but the wording of the Sense of the Senate Resolution should be softened so we are not coming down so one-sided on the one group and against the other group.

**Senator Clark** said from the documents we are reading, there are too few hard numbers to come to conclusion. 95% parity is referring to clerical workers as a whole, not in any certain positions. I do not want to evaluate the individual numbers. The AFSCME document does not provide any hard evidence that there is an unfair wage proposal. I cannot vote in favor of this language.

**Senator Blum** said we have our pie for the year, locally small. I heard Dr. Strand defending the University's expenditures in general. I do not know where the salary equity will be addressed in a particular year, you can address all the inequities at once. Clerical workers are underpaid. We should work toward addressing these problems, rather than tearing people apart in a public forum. No one is well paid; the administrators, the faculty, or the clerical worker, etc. This is counter productive.

**Senator Reid** would like to draw attention to the State of Illinois 87th General Assembly Senate Resolution provided by the clerical workers. "Whereas, University Civil Service employees salaries which are significantly less than those of similar employees at other State agencies; therefore, be it resolved that salary increases be distributed to faculty and civil service staff in a manner which moves toward the goal of equity within appropriate comparison groups, etc." We have to make this much more positive, but I would like to encourage those to work towards parity.

**Senator Nelsen** asked if it is appropriate to make a friendly amendment to said document. *Reply* - Parliamentarian Cohen said yes. Will Brooks and Reid accept a friendly amendment to strike through

*Whereas, they will be at least 30% behind parity at the end of the three-year contract proposed by University negotiators, and*  
*1) Strongly oppose the unfair and penurious wage proposal offered by the University*

and leave this as a much more positive statement? The clerical are deserving of raises, and the parity is an important part of the overall circumstance.

**XXIX-15** Motion by Senator Nelsen, is this friendly amendment acceptable? Reply - Senator Brooks, yes and Senator Reid, yes.

**XXIX-16** Motion by Senator Nelsen (seconded by Brook) moving the questions. Approved by voice vote with 30 aye, 4 nay, 3 abstentions.

**XXIX-06** Motion postponed at August 27 Senate meeting by Senator Brooks (seconded by Reid) a *Sense of the Senate Resolution* will now state:

**Whereas**, clerical workers are an indispensable part of the ISU family, and  
~~*Whereas, they will be at least 30% behind parity at the end of the three-year contract proposed by University negotiators, and*~~

**Whereas**, the concept of parity compared to other state employees in the same positions as a cornerstone of equitable salary policy,

Therefore we the members of the Academic Senate:

~~—1) Strongly oppose the unfair and penurious wage proposal offered by the University;~~

- 2) Urge President Strand to authorize a salary proposal to clerical workers that is reflective of the substantial contributions these individuals make to the success of ISU and that acknowledges the goal of wage parity.

**Senator McCaw** asked where are the additional 3% parity dollars allocated from? *Reply* - President Strand said when appointed as President in April 1996, as part of accepting the position as President, I stated there would be a salary equity plan put into place. The State of the University address last year, indicated with more specificity the dollar amount, indicated it would come from reallocation, and indicated the clerical people would be the first group to receiving salary equity funds. These dollars will all come from internal reallocation at the University. Senator Taylor said as part of FY97 budget process recognizing the commitment that we made for the future, part of the allocations made that year were on a one time only basis to make sure that were available during the current fiscal year.

Approved by a voice vote with 17 aye, 5 nay, 15 abstentions.

**Adjournment:**

**XXIX-17** Motion to adjourn at 9:35 pm by Senator McCaw (seconded by Clark. The motion carried unanimously on a standing vote with no abstentions.

September 10, 1997

Date: 9/10/97	Vol. XXIX	No. 2									
Name	Attendance	Motion	Motion	Motion	Motion	Motion	Motion	Motion	Motion	Motion	Motion
		#09	#10	#11	#12	#13	#14	#15	#16	#6 (8/27/97)	#17
		all yes	all yes	all yes	all yes	all yes	all yes				all yes
Barickman	arr 7:55	no abst.	no abst.	no abst.	no abst.	no abst.	no abst.		****	abstain	no abst.
Bender	X								yes	no	
Blum	X								yes	abstain	
Borg	X								yes	abstain	
Boschini	X								abstain	abstain	
Brook	X								yes	yes	
Brooks	X								yes	yes	
Chelluri	X								no	abstain	
Clark	X								yes	no	
Cook	X								yes	yes	
Craddock	X								yes	abstain	
Deakins	X								yes	abstain	
Dodson	X								yes	no vote	
Finn	absent								****	****	
Fisher	left 8:30								****	yes	
Garner	X								yes	abstain	
Gore	X								yes	yes	
Hohner	X								yes	yes	
Jannazzo	X								yes	yes	
Johnson	absent								****	****	
Jones	X								yes	abstain	
Joyce	X								yes	abstain	
Kurtz	X								yes	yes	
Lockwood	X								no	no	
MacDonald	X								yes	yes	
McCaw	X								yes	no	
Nelsen	X							yes	yes	yes	
Neuleib	X								no	no	
Newgren	X								yes	yes	
Ori	X								****	****	
Razaki	X								no	yes	
Reeder	X								yes	no vote	
Reid	X							yes	yes	yes	
Schmaltz	X								****	****	
Schwartz	X								yes	yes	
Strand	X								abstain	abstain	
Taylor	X								abstain	abstain	
Thompson	X								yes	no vote	
Timmerman	left 8:30								****	****	
Urice	excused								****	****	
VanVooren	X								yes	abstain	
Varner	X								yes	yes	
Walters	X								yes	yes	
Weber	X								yes	abstain	
Weldon	X								yes	abstain	
White	X								yes	yes	
Young	absent								****	****	
Zielinski	excused								****	****	